

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_105544
Title of the Manuscript:	Micro Nutrient Management for Enhanced Growth, Yield, and Quality of Mango: A Comprehensive Review
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is important for the scientific community because it shows synthetically what are the main results of the application of complex management, micronutrients and nutrients on the mango culture. The synthesis can guide the following research. 2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable. 3. Yes the abstract of the article is comprehensive. 4. According to the journal authors' guide (https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy), review articles must contain between 5000 and 9000 words and 50-150 references, and minireview works between 3000 and 6000 words. and 30-70 references. This paper or article proposal does not fall into the category of minireview works, even though it is titled comprehensive review. The work has 3432 words including references and only 28 titles in the list of references, possibly 2-3 more adding those cited and not written in the list of references. As a result, possible publication can only be done by enriching the material or negotiating with the editor and motivating the importance of the work. Also, the work has neither tables nor figures. 5. I showed in 4. that the paper does not meet the minimum requirements of a review paper. The literature used is few and only 8 out of 28 works from the list of references were published in the last 10 years. In addition, it is not understood from the title that the authors refer only to the mango crops in the territory of India. Having several studies available, the authors should also prepare tabulated summaries in which they present the number of approaches to the problem of mango crop nutrition management, the typical conclusions, the dependence on the geographical area of study, and the research. A valuable review study would be one that would make assessments on the costs and profitability of crops managed according to the new principles compared to those that use classical management. From these points of view, I appreciate the work not incorrect but incomplete, for now. 7. In the journal template it is indicated: "References must be listed at the end of the manuscript and numbered in the order that they appear in the text. Every reference referred in the text must also present in the reference list and vice versa. In the text, citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets [3]. " As a result, the list of references must be numbered, and the citations in the text must be redone. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>It is recommended to apply to the editor for the English language accepted in the journal (UK, US or India?). Then you can check with the text editor, but also with specialized programs (Grammarly, QuillBot, free or higher versions). Pay close attention to articles applied to various words.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Considering the appreciations from 1.-5., a major revision followed by a new review is recommended.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Cardei Petru
Department, University & Country	The National Institute of Research Development for Machines and Installations Designed for Agriculture and Food Industry, Romania